

## REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that dependent Claims 8-10 contain allowable subject matter, and would be allowed if amended into independent form. However, in light of the following remarks, Applicants have opted not to amend Claims 8-10 into independent form at this time.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 4,902,971 to Guzik et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Guzik et al. reference fails to disclose all of the features of the present invention as defined in independent Claim 1. More specifically, the Guzik et al. reference fails to disclose a magnetic head tester that includes, *inter alia*, suspension means provided on the holder, where the suspension means "has the same function as a suspension supporting the slider in a real apparatus," as defined in independent Claim 1. In other words, the suspension means of Claim 1 is not actually a suspension, as this term is traditionally used in the art, but instead merely functions like a suspension.

One example of an embodiment of the present invention as defined in Claim 1 is shown in Applicants' Figures 1-3 (other examples of embodiment defined by Claim 1 are shown in Applicants' Figures 4-11). In the embodiment of Figures 1-3, a holder 20 is shown, which removably holds the slider in a position opposed to the surface of medium 40. Figures

1-3 also show one example of a suspension means provided on the holder, where the suspension means in this embodiment includes supporting pin 28 (and, in this embodiment, also preferably includes springs 30 and 24).

The magnetic head tester of Claim 1 is capable of testing the characteristics of the slider, as a single element, before the slider is mounted upon a suspension. Thus, the magnetic head tester includes a suspension means, such as a supporting pin, that performs the same function as the suspension in a regular disk drive (i.e., a real apparatus), without actually using a suspension. Therefore, the slider can be tested under the same conditions as if it were attached to a real apparatus, with the benefit of permitting testing prior to mounting the slider to a suspension. Accordingly, in cases where the slider turns out to be defective, only the slider needs to be discarded, without the wasted expense of discarding a suspension also, thereby saving the cost of the suspension, as well as the costs of assembling the slider and the suspension together.

In contrast, in both Prior Art Figure 1 and the embodiment of Figure 2 of the Guzik et al. reference, the slider 18 is held by a suspension, as this term is used in the art. More specifically, the suspension in Figure 1 is shown between holder 16 and slider, and the suspension in Figure 2 is shown between slider 52 and front arm portion 48. Thus, instead of including a suspension means that is different from a suspension, but which “has the same function as a suspension supporting the slider in a real apparatus,” as defined in Claim 1, the devices of Guzik et al. each actually include a suspension. Therefore, unlike in the present

invention (in which the slider can be tested on its own, without a suspension), the sliders of the Guzik et al. reference are tested after being attached to a suspension. Accordingly, if one of the sliders of Guzik et al. is defective, both the slider and the suspension need to be discarded, since the slider has already been attached to the suspension. Therefore, the cost savings of the present invention (from avoiding the assembly step of attaching the slider to the suspension and from not needing to discard a suspension) are not realized in the devices of Guzik et al. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §102(b) rejection of independent Claim 1 and associated dependent Claims 2 and 3.

Additionally, Applicants also separately traverse dependent Claims 2 and 3. With regard to dependent Claim 2, Applicants respectfully submit that the Guzik et al. reference fails to disclose the claimed holder base for “inclinably holding said holder, with respect to the surface of the medium.” In the office Action, the Examiner equated element 10 of Figure 1 of Guzik et al. with the claimed holder base. However, housing 10 of Guzik et al. cannot be considered as the claimed “holder base” because it does not hold member 16 (which the Examiner equated with the claimed holder) in any manner that can be considered as being “inclinably . . . with respect to the surface of the medium,” as recited in Claim 2. Accordingly, for this reason also, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §102(b) rejection of dependent Claim 2.

With regard to dependent Claim 3, Applicants respectfully submit that that Guzik et al. reference fails to disclose the claimed supporting pin, which, *inter alia*, “supports

and contacts a load center of said holder.” In the Office Action, the Examiner equated element 44 of Figure 2 of the Guzik et al. reference with the claimed “supporting pin.” However, as can be clearly seen from Figure 2, element 44 is nowhere near the “load center” of arm 46, which Applicants’ believe that the Examiner is considering as the “holder.” Instead of supporting and contacting the “load center” of arm 46, element 44 is positioned toward the far end of arm 46. Thus, for this reason also, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §102(b) rejection of dependent Claim 3.

Claims 4-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Guzik et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,317,295 to Nakagawa. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 4-7 all depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 1, and therefore include all of the features of Claim 1, plus additional features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of dependent Claims 4-7 under Guzik et al. in view of Nakagawa be withdrawn considering the above remarks directed to independent Claim 1, and also because the Nakagawa reference does not remedy the deficiencies noted above, nor was it relied upon as such.

Additionally, the combination of Guzik et al. and Nakagawa also fails to disclose all of the features of dependent Claim 4 (which is the claim from which dependent Claims 5 and 6 further depend). More specifically, spring 8 of the Nakgawa reference cannot be considered as being “provided between said holder and said holder base”

(emphasis added), as defined in Claim 4. In Applicants' Figure 5-7, springs 70, 71 and 72, are clearly between each holder 60 and its associated holder base 62. In contrast, spring 8 of Nakagawa is not "between" members 4 and 2 (which the Examiner has equated with the claimed holder and holder base). Instead, spring 8 of Nakagawa is located adjacent to members 4 and 2, on one side of these members. Accordingly, for this reason also, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §103 rejection of Claims 4-7.

Finally, Applicants have also added new Claims 11-16. Applicants respectfully submit that these new claims are also allowable over the cited references.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of the application, or that outstanding issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By   
James K. Folker  
Registration No. 37,538

November 10, 2005

Suite 2500  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978

P:\DOCS\2309\68752\904434.DOC